

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated October 2, 2003, claims 1-28 were presented for examination. Claims 27 and 28 were allowed. Claims 3-7, 12-15, 17, 24, and 26 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 16, 21, 23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Temma et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,796,996. Claims 8-9, 18, 20, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Temma et al.*

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the careful and thorough review and action on the merits in this application. The following remarks are provided in support of the pending claims and responsive to the Office Action of October 2, 2003 for the pending application.

### **I. Rejection of claims 1-2, 10-11, 16, 21, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

In the Office Action of October 2, 2003, the Examiner assigned to the application rejected claims 1-2, 10-11, 16, 21, 23, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Temma et al.* ('996). The *Temma et al.* patent ('996) relates to a CPU and a method for executing an instruction. More specifically, *Temma et al.* shows a single CPU executing an instruction. However, *Temma et al.* does not show any "force" associated with the memory barrier execution. Rather, *Temma et al.* shows force associated with ejection of the output buffer, which is not the memory barrier instruction. See Col. 3, lines 20-21. In addition, upon completion of the instruction, the CPU of *Temma et al.* receives an indicator. "[T]he completion of the ejection is notified to the CPU 700 together with a response of the real data by the execution of the read instruction." Col. 4, lines 2-5. The indicator of *Temma et al.* comes from a device or memory to the CPU, not from the CPU as claimed by Applicant. Finally, *Temma et al.* provide support to prevent interrupts, but does not provide support for sending an interprocessor interrupt. Accordingly, the execution of the instruction as well as the response associated with completion of the instruction of *Temma et al.* operate under different parameters and a different

environment than that claimed by Applicant.

Applicant's invention *forces* each CPU to execute a memory barrier instruction. The execution of the memory barrier instruction invalidates stale data and ensures that reading CPUs will access new data in a modified data structure. Upon completion of the memory barrier instruction, each CPU sends a communication to indicate completion of the memory barrier instruction. This step ensures a recordation in a common location indicating completion of the memory barrier instruction. Accordingly, the execution of a memory barrier instruction of Applicant enables a writing CPU to ensure invalidation of old data prior to updating a pointer to the data structure for new data.

There is no teaching in *Temma et al.* for forcing each CPU to execute a memory barrier instruction. Nor is there a teaching in *Temma et al.* to send an interprocessor interrupt to all CPUs as a part of the step of forcing the CPUs to execute the memory barrier instruction. Rather, *Temma et al.* merely indicates that a CPU executes an instruction without any association of force therewith, and without sending an interprocessor interrupt. Additionally, there is no teaching in *Temma et al.* for a CPU to send an indicator to communicate completion of the memory barrier instruction. In fact, *Temma et al.* functions on the opposite principle. The CPU of *Temma et al.* is adapted to receive an indicator not to send an indicator. In order for the claimed invention to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), the prior art must teach all claimed limitations presented by the claimed invention. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP §2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F. 2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). As mentioned above, *Temma et al.* does not show all of the elements as claimed by Applicant in pending claims 1-2, 10-11, 16, 21, 23, and 25. Specifically, *Temma et al.* does not support the use of force associated with execution of a memory barrier instruction, rather *Temma et al.* merely shows synchronous execution between a writing operation of the memory mapped register with execution of the CPU instruction. See Col. 3, lines 18-20. The only element of force present in *Temma et al.* is ejection of the output buffer. With respect to communication completion of the memory barrier

instruction, the CPU of *Temma et al.* receives an indicator. See Col. 4, line 3. The CPU of Applicant sends an indicator in response to completion of the memory barrier instruction. Accordingly, *Temma et al.* clearly fails to teach the limitations pertaining to the memory barrier instruction as presented in Applicant's pending claims 1-2, 10-11, 16, 21, 23, and 25.

Finally, "[a] previous patent anticipates a purported invention only where, except for insubstantial differences, it contains all of the same elements operating in the same fashion to perform an identical function." *Saunders v. Air-Flo Co.*, 646 F.2d 1201, 1203 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981) citing *Popeil Brothers, Inc. v. Schick Electric, Inc.*, 494 F. 2d 162, 164 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1974) (holding patents were not invalid as being anticipated by or obvious in light of prior art). *Temma et al.* does not anticipate the invention of Applicant based upon the legal definition of anticipation. Although the prior art cited by the Examiner relates to processors and instructions associated therewith, *Temma et al.* fails to show each and every element as presented in Applicant's claimed invention. In fact, *Temma et al.* does not show each CPU being forced to execute a memory barrier instruction, or each CPU sending an indicator in response to completion of the memory barrier instruction. Rather, *Temma et al.* shows a CPU execution of an instruction, followed by receipt of the CPU of notification of completion of ejection of the output buffer. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to remove the rejection of claims 1-2, 10-11, 16, 21, 23, and 25, and to provide allowance of this application.

## **II. Rejection of claims 8-9, 18-20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

In the Office Action dated October 2, 2003, the Examiner assigned to the application rejected claims 8, 9, 18-20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Temma et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,796,996.

The discussion of *Temma et al.* above is hereby incorporated by reference.

Applicant's invention functions on a different principle than that taught in *Temma et al.* The *Temma et al.* patent does not force each CPU to execute a memory barrier instruction, nor

require each CPU to send an indicator to communicate completion of the memory barrier instruction. The Examiner takes Official Notice regarding the use of an array for CPUs to register memory barrier requests, as well as the selection of mediums. Applicant hereby objects to the Official Notice taken by the Examiner. "The examiner must provide specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support his or her conclusion of common knowledge." MPEP §2144.03(B). Furthermore, claims 8-9, 18-20, and 22 are dependent claims. Applicant contends that the elements taught in independent claims 1, 10, and 21 are not anticipated by *Temma et al.*, as discussed above. Since *Temma et al.* does not teach all of the elements present in the rejected independent claims, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejected dependent claims. Accordingly, removal of the rejection of claims 8-9, 18-20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Temma et al.* ('996) is respectfully requested.

For the reasons outlined above, withdrawal of the rejection of record and an allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Rochelle Lieberman  
Registration No. 39,276  
Attorney for Applicant

Lieberman & Brandsdorfer, LLC  
12221 McDonald Chapel Drive  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878-2252  
Phone: (301) 948-7775  
Fax: (301) 948-7774  
Email: [rocky@legalplanner.com](mailto:rocky@legalplanner.com)

Date: January 2, 2004